

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-35 are pending in the application. Claims 1-35 are rejected.

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-35 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement as containing subject matter not described in the Specification.

Contrary to Examiner's remarks in the Final Office Action dated May 12, 2007, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 1-35 do indeed comply with the enablement requirements under 35 U.S.C. 112. In the previous office action, the Examiner asserted that independent claims 1, 10, 23, 32 and 34 are directed to detecting and decoding data comprising detecting the size of the data signals to use as a factor for decoding the data and decoding the receives that are data signals, and that the disclosure does not support these elements. Applicant respectfully disagrees. In response to the Applicant citing various exemplary portions of the specification to show support of all of the elements of the claims, the Examiner asserted that the disclosure does not provide enablement as to how and which component or element explicitly detects a size of received set of signal. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Those skilled in the art would readily decipher the various exemplary components that perform the various steps recited in the claims. For example, the specification clearly discloses that the counter 240 increments the work count number, which may be indicative of the size of the data. *See* Specification, page 14, lines 6-10. The Specification also discloses that the host circuitry 150 can predetermine the composition of the data packets stored in memory. *See* Specification, page 14, lines 20-22. Still further, the Specification discloses that the mask circuitry [0 - n] 270 can facilitate the selective clocking of data comparison results, by checking the status of an extra bit that is transmitted in

the data packets. *See* Specification, page 17, line 22-24. These exemplary components perform various steps called for by claims of the present invention, thereby properly enabling all aspects of the present invention. Applicant respectfully asserts that these are examples, and the various scopes of the claims are not limited to the disclosed embodiments. Those skilled in the art, upon a reading of the present patent application, could readily decipher the various components that are capable of performing the steps called for by claims of the present invention. Accordingly, the Examiner erred in the Final Office action dated May 12, 2007 in rejecting the claims for allegedly lacking enablement.

The Specification clearly supports all of the elements of claims of the present invention. For example, Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner's attention to page 14, lines 1-23 of the Specification. In this example, the specification clearly notes that a serial to parallel converter and the data formatter receives data and converts to a serial stream into parallel format. *See* Specification, page 14, lines 4-5 of the Specification. The data formatter 220 uses a serial clock signal to convert it to a parallel word clock on a line 217. *See* page 14, lines 6-7. The word clock signal on the line 217 then increments the word count number in the counter 240, wherein the word count number is set to the address input of the memory elements [0-N] 330. *See* page 14, lines 6-10. The Specification discloses that known data value or expected data patterns can be programmed into the memory elements [0-N] 330. *See* Specification, page 13, lines 15-17. The Specification discloses that the a change in the word count number sent to the memory element 330 prompts the next set of possible matching frame of data is extracted from memory. *See* page 14, lines 12-13. Utilizing the comparators 320-326, the host interface 245 can predetermine the composition of the data packets, which should match any data packets that are

addressed to that particular host. This stored data, as well as incoming data, may be used by the comparators 260 to determine if the respective data sets match. *See* Specification, page 14, lines 13-23. These steps, which utilize the size of the data, (*e.g.*, implementing the word count number and the counter 240), along with various logic gates and comparators), determine whether the value of signal indicating a proper match has been found and, if so, then the byte portion of the data latched. *See* Specification, page 14, line 22- page 16, line 7.

Another example of the size of the data being used to perform the detection and decoding of the data, in support of the claims is provided on pages 17-18 of the Specification. The Specification discloses that in one embodiment, an extra bit per byte, affecting the length of the data frame, is transmitted. *See* Specification, page 17, line 25-page 18, line 1. The Specification discloses that the data detector/decoder 130 will receive data sets that have a size of  $n$  by 9, instead of  $n$  by 8. *See* Specification, page 18, lines 1-3. This extra bit will indicate whether the comparison results of the associated data segment should be ignored or not. *See* Specification, page 18, lines 3-9. The extra bit, *i.e.*, the mask bit, is used by the mask circuitry 270 to facilitate selectivity of clocking-in of the data comparison results into registers 285. *See* Specification, page 18, lines 6-9. Therefore, the size of the data that is transmitted may be used to perform the decoding called for by claims of the present invention. Therefore, this is yet another example of the support for the using the size as a factor for decoding the data. The embodiments described above are merely examples of subject matter that support the claims, and as such, they do not limit the scope of the claims.

Therefore, various disclosures adequately support the various elements of the claims, including detecting the size of the data to use as a factor for decoding the data, and decoding the

received set of data. Therefore, claims 1, 10, 23, 32, and 34 are, indeed, supported by the Specification and are novel in light of the arguments provided in the Appeal Brief and this Response (wherein the arguments provided in the Appeal Brief is incorporated by reference herein).

Applicant respectfully asserts that in light of the amendments and arguments provided by Applicant throughout the prosecution of the present application, all claims of the present application are now allowable and, therefore, request that a Notice of Allowance be issued.

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the **Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney** at the Houston, Texas telephone number (713) 934-4069 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

WILLIAMS, MORGAN & AMERSON, P.C.  
CUSTOMER NO. 23720

Date: July 12, 2007

By: /Jaison C. John/  
Jaison C. John  
Reg. No. 50,737  
10333 Richmond, Suite 1100  
Houston, Texas 77042  
(713) 934-4069  
(713) 934-7011 (facsimile)  
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)